

Appl. No. : 09/235,084
Filed : January 21, 1999

REMARKS

Applicants respectfully request reconsideration of the present application in view of the following remarks. Please charge any additional fees, including any fees for additional extension of time, or credit overpayment to Deposit Account No. 11-1410.

Rejection of Claims 19-25, 27, 28 and 31 Under 35 U.S.C. § 102(e)

The Examiner rejected Claims 19-25, 27, 28 and 31 under 35 U.S.C. § 102(e) as being anticipated by U.S. Patent No. 5,787,247 to Norin et al. (hereinafter "Norin"). Norin teaches a distributed database system, not a gateway configured to allow multiple nodes on a computer network to communicate using one or more protocols. In Norin, the data in the database is conventional database data (e.g., employee records, billing records, etc.) not information about nodes in the network. Norin does not teach or suggest an internal node database comprising information about nodes on a network.

Regarding Claim 19, Norin does not teach or suggest creating a node database containing information about the nodes, designating an active gateway node to maintain the node database, the active gateway node providing one or more access methods to access the node database, mirroring the node database in one or more standby server nodes, and transitioning a first standby server nodes to an active state when said first standby server node detects that said active gateway node has not responded to a request from a client node.

Regarding Claim 20 in combination with Claim 19, Norin does not teach or suggest interpreting and executing rules that specify actions to be taken when a state change occurs in a client node.

Regarding Claim 21 in combination with Claim 20, Norin does not teach or suggest that the rules are interpreted by a rules engine.

Regarding Claim 22 in combination with Claim 20, Norin does not teach or suggest generating event notifications when the state change occurs.

Regarding Claim 23 in combination with Claim 22, Norin does not teach or suggest that the notifications are provided to a dispatcher.

Regarding Claim 24 in combination with Claim 20, Norin does not teach or suggest translating received data into a rule definition language.

Regarding Claim 25 in combination with Claim 20, Norin does not teach or suggest that the state change includes a change in an instance variable of the client node.

Regarding Claim 27 in combination with Claim 19, Norin does not teach or suggest activating one of the standby server nodes after the active server becomes inactive.

Regarding Claim 28 in combination with Claim 19, Norin does not teach or suggest encapsulating raw packets in a first protocol into wrapper packets in the desired protocol and tunneling the raw packets through the desired protocol.

Regarding Claim 31 in combination with Claim 19, Norin does not teach or suggest notifying a user application when a change occurs in an instance variable of the client node.

Accordingly, Applicants assert that Claims 1-7, 9, 10, 13, 14, 19-25, 27, 28 and 31 are allowable over the prior art, and Applicants request allowance of Claims 1-7, 9, 10, 13, 14, 19-25, 27, 28 and 31.

Rejection of Claims 1-7, 9, 10, 13, and 14 Under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a)

The Examiner rejected Claims 1-7, 9, 10, 13, and 14 under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as being anticipated by Norin in view of U.S. Patent No. 5,550,906 to Chau et al. ("Chau"). Norin teaches a distributed database system, not a gateway configured to allow multiple nodes on a computer network to communicate using one or more protocols. In Norin, the data in the database is conventional database data (e.g., employee records, billing records, etc.) not information about nodes in the network. Norin does not teach or suggest an internal node database comprising information about nodes on a network. Chau teaches telephone PBX system. Neither Norin nor Chau teaches or suggests transitioning to an active state when an unacknowledged client node request is detected.

Regarding Claim 1, The cited combination does not teach or suggest an internal node database comprising information about nodes on a network, a protocol converter configured to allow the nodes on the computer network to communicate using one or more data protocols according to information in the node database, wherein the one or more data protocols are transmitted over a network medium using a medium protocol, an application programming interface to communicate with the nodes, a software module configured to provide an active mode and a standby mode, the active mode configured to maintain the internal node database and to provide access to the node database, the standby mode configured to maintain the internal node database as a mirror copy of an external node database and to transition to the active mode when an unacknowledged client node request is detected.

Regarding Claim 2 in combination with Claim 1, The cited combination does not teach or suggest that the internal node database includes rules that specify actions to be taken upon a state change of a client node.

Regarding Claim 3 in combination with Claim 2, The cited combination does not teach or suggest that the rules are simple rules.

Regarding Claim 4 in combination with Claim 2, The cited combination does not teach or suggest that the rules are complex rules.

Regarding Claim 5 in combination with Claim 2, The cited combination does not teach or suggest a rules engine configured to interpret the rules.

Regarding Claim 6 in combination with Claim 2, The cited combination does not teach or suggest shims configured to translate rules into a rule definition language.

Regarding Claim 7 in combination with Claim 2, The cited combination does not teach or suggest that the state change includes a change in an instance variable of the client node.

Regarding Claim 10 in combination with Claim 1, The cited combination does not teach or suggest that the gateway is further configured to tunnel a first protocol through a second protocol.

Regarding Claim 13 in combination with Claim 7, The cited combination does not teach or suggest an event handler configured to notify a user application when a change occurs in an instance variable of the client node.

Regarding Claim 14 in combination with Claim 1, The cited combination does not teach or suggest an object-oriented application programming interface.

Accordingly, Applicants assert that Claims 1-7, 10, 13, and 14 are allowable over the prior art, and Applicants request allowance of Claims 1-7, 10, 13, and 14.

Rejection of Claims 8, 11, 12, 15, 26, 29, 30, 32 and 33 Under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a)

The Examiner rejected Claims 8, 11, 12, 15, 26, 29, 30, 32 and 33 under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as being unpatentable over Norin in view of Chau. Norin teaches a distributed database system, not a gateway configured to allow multiple nodes on a computer network to communicate using one or more protocols. In Norin, the data in the database is conventional database data (e.g., employee records, billing records, etc.) not information about the nodes. Norin does not teach or suggest an internal node database comprising information about nodes on a network. Moreover, Norin teaches database servers as being active, deleted (having no database

data) or in some phase of deletion (e.g. delete pending, delete now, etc.). In the delete phases, the database data is not being updated or maintained. Norin does not teach or suggest a standby state configured to maintain the internal node database as a mirror copy of an external node database. Chau teaches a telephone PBX system. Norin and/or Chau do not teach or suggest converting from one protocol to another, and do not teach or suggest communication on a power line medium.

The Examiner's assertion that power line protocol and PLX protocol are known in the art is incorrect. The power line protocol and PLX protocol were developed by Applicant and first described herein. The use of power lines to transmit data is known in the art, but not using the power line protocol or PLX protocol as described in the application. Moreover, a Internet browsers are known in the art, but not as described by Applicant. The Examiner is reminded that it is impermissible to base a rejection on the mere fact that a claim element, such as an Internet browser, is found in the prior art. The element must be used as described and claimed by Applicant and the prior art must provide a suggestion to make the combination. The Examiner has found no such art. The Examiner is using impermissible hindsight.

Regarding Claim 8 in combination with Claim 1, Norin does not teach or suggest that the internal node database is updated by issuing ping requests. The Examiner is attempting to use hindsight in pointing to references such as U.S. Patent No. 6,272,127 to Golden et al. No combination of Golden with Norin and Chau teaches or suggest issuing ping requests to update an internal node database that contains protocol information. Moreover, there is no suggestion to combine Golden with Norin or Chau to update an internal node database that contains protocol information. There is no suggestion to combine Norin and Chau with Golden in the manner described by the Examiner. The Examiner is using Applicants' disclosure as a blueprint to combine prior art references in an attempt to formulate a rejection. The Examiner is using hindsight to combine the references.

Regarding Claim 11 in combination with Claim 10, Norin does not teach or suggest that the medium is a power line and the medium protocol is a power line protocol.

Regarding Claim 12 in combination with Claim 1, Norin does not teach or suggest that the medium is a power line and the medium protocol is a PLX protocol.

Appl. No. : 02235,084
Filed : January 21, 1999

Regarding Claim 15 in combination with Claim 14 Norin does not teach or suggest an internet browser configured to provide a user interface to information in the internal node database.

Regarding Claim 26 in combination with Claim 19, Norin does not teach or suggest issuing ping requests and listening for responses to the ping requests, the responses used to update the node database.

Regarding Claim 29 in combination with Claim 19, Norin does not teach or suggest that the medium is a power line and the medium protocol is a power line protocol.

Regarding Claim 30 in combination with Claim 19, Norin does not teach or suggest that the medium is a power line and the medium protocol is a PLX protocol.

Regarding Claim 32 in combination with Claim 19, Norin does not teach or suggest using an internet browser to view information in the node database.

Regarding Claim 33 in combination with Claim 19, Norin does not teach or suggest using an internet browser to control nodes on a power line network.

Accordingly, Applicants assert that Claims 8, 11, 12, 15, 26, 29, 30, 32 and 33 are allowable over the prior art, and Applicants request allowance of Claims 8, 11, 12, 15, 26, 29, 30, 32 and 33.

Summary

Applicants assert that Claims 1-8, 10-16 and 19-33 are allowable over the prior art, and Applicants request allowance of Claims 1-8, 10-16 and 19-33. If there are any remaining issues that can be resolved by a telephone conference, the Examiner is invited to call the undersigned attorney at (949) 721-6305.

Respectfully submitted,
KNOBBE, MARTENS, OLSON & BEAR, LLP

Dated: Feb 23, 2004

By: Lee W. Henderson
Lee W. Henderson Ph.D.
Registration No. 41,830
Attorney of Record
Customer No. 20,995
(949) 760-0404